

**To:** Wood, Charles[Wood.Charles@epa.gov]  
**From:** McQueen, Jacqueline  
**Sent:** Wed 11/4/2015 7:49:37 PM  
**Subject:** RE: glyphosate review

Thanks, I think we want to see how the briefing tomorrow goes . Are you planning on calling in?

Jackie

**From:** Wood, Charles  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2015 2:48 PM  
**To:** McQueen, Jacqueline <McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** glyphosate review

Hi Jackie,

It was nice speaking with you this morning. I am a Research Biologist in the Carcinogenesis Branch of ISTD/NHEERL/ORD. My scientific background is in comparative pathology and cancer biology. I am currently the only board-certified veterinary pathologist at EPA. Since 2012, I have served as the in-house pathologist for the EPA Cancer Assessment Review Committee (CARC) and as an ad-hoc advisor for the Toxicology Science Advisory Council in the EPA Office of Pesticide Programs.

For cancer reviews, data are typically sorted into nonclinical (animal), epidemiologic, mechanistic, and genotoxicity categories. For the glyphosate review, my focus was on the 11 rodent carcinogenicity studies. The IARC concluded that there was "sufficient evidence" in experimental animals based on the presence of kidney tumors and hemangiosarcomas in male mice. The CARC concluded that neither of these tumor outcomes was treatment-related. Briefing slide 10 provides rationale points for this decision. As we discussed, I think an important consideration for the CARC was the presence of additional studies in same strain and often at higher doses which did not reproduce these outcomes. I am not sure that IARC necessarily considered the negative data.

Let me know if you need additional information.

--Charles

Charles E. Wood, DVM, PhD, DACVP

Office of Research and Development

US Environmental Protection Agency

Email: [wood.charles@epa.gov](mailto:wood.charles@epa.gov)

Phone: 919-541-1171